CHAPTER THREE

"Fear and Trembling" Language in Fourth- and Fifth-Century Liturgical Texts: From Bishop to Schmemann to a Corrected View

by Bishop Auxentios

The question of the introduction of so-called "fear and trembling" language into the Christian rites of the fourth century is essentially a question of the influence presumably exerted on post-Constantinian Christianity by the process of "Hellenization" and, more precisely, by its encounter with the mystery religions of the pagan Greek world. Though rightly admitting that the pre-fourth-century Christian body was largely Greek and that it contained some elements of the higher classes, A.H.M. Jones argues that the Greek pagan world came to impinge on Christianity after the Peace of Constantine primarily because Christianity came into contact with new segments of Greek society;[1] it was now "Hellenized" by intellectuals, by the literati, who supposedly endowed its rites with the mysteriological language of the Greek mystery cults. Whereas "in its early days" Christianity was a "vulgar religion"—its holy books "uncouth and barbaric" and "written in a Greek or Latin which grated on the sensibilities of any educated man," so that some educated Christians undertook to rewrite them "as epic poems, Attic tragedies, and Platonic dialogues"—, it was by the fourth century a religion with a respectable literature.[2]

One of the earliest studies in the history of worship to suggest a disparity between pre- and post-fourth-century liturgical language, especially in the Christian East, is Edmund Bishop's investigation of the association of dread with the Eucharistic service.[3] He finds in the language of fear and awe employed by Church Fathers as early as St. Cyril of Jerusalem (b. 313?) in his mystagogical catecheses (presumed to have been written toward the end of his long episcopate),[4] and notably in St. John Chrysostomos (354-407), clear evidence of a fourth-century departure from the Eucharistic "sacrament of love," which came to be "invested with attributes of cultural

dread."[5] Bishop attributes this shift in language not to pious feelings of humility and unworthiness, but to a sense of dread "attending on the *consecration*" and at one's "mere presence at the mystical act itself."[6] Bishop cites as clear evidence of this shift the "sharp contrast"[7] between Chrysostomos' approach to the Eucharistic mystery and that of the fourth-century Cappadocians, Sts. Basil, Gregory of Constantinople (Nazianzen), and Gregory of Nyssa, the former representing a break with pre-fourth-century tradition and the latter a continuation of that tradition. Citing numerous passages from Gregory Nazianzen and Gregory of Nyssa in particular, he argues that the Cappadocians never associate the Eucharist with "the idea of awe and dread."[8] In the writings of Chrysostomos, he finds, on the other hand, a constant association of the mystery with φρίκη (fear) and τρόμος (trembling).[9]

   Bishop also turns to liturgical texts *per se* in establishing that the late fourth and the fifth centuries saw a proliferation of fear and trembling language attached to the Eucharistic mystery. He writes that:

> The same kind of contrast appears when we compare the earliest extant Greek liturgy texts, Serapion from Egypt of the middle of the fourth century and the liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions, with St. James, St. Basil and St. Chrysostomos. In Serapion there is no word expressive of fear in connection with the Eucharistic service; in the liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions, but once, and it seems doubtful if even this be not a product (indeed an intrusion out of place) of the kind of devotion developed in the region of Antioch in the second half of the fourth century rather than a traditional formula. 'St. James' very freely, and in a less marked degree 'St. Basil' and 'St. Chrysostom,' insist on the element of fear.[10]

   He further observes that the "multiplied prayers" of the Greek Liturgies, with their emphasis on the unworthiness of the Priest as the offerer of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, constitute "a spirit indeed quite alien from that which finds expression in the Prayer Book of Serapion and the Liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions."[11] To the Antiochian influence on liturgical language in the fourth and fifth centuries he also attributes changes in the liturgical traditions of Eastern Syria, suggesting that the appearance of fear and trembling language in that liturgical form represented the expansion of Greek influence, in the late fourth and fifth centuries, beyond the borders of Greek Churches as such.[12]

Georg Kretschmar, building on Bishop's research and commentary, also contends that, with the growth of Christianity in the fourth century, the rites of Baptism and the Eucharist were transformed into new rituals. Services, took on "*den Charakter einer öffentlichen Institution*,"[13] or the "properties of a public institution." Rather than being joined in common Baptism, the faithful came to be divided between the Baptized communicants and those awaiting or deferring Baptism, Kretschmar argues.[14] The Eucharist, by the same token, lost the character of intimacy or "community sharing" which he attributes to the earlier Christian mystery (sacrament); instead, it became something closely related to personal devotion and separated from the experience of the common table. The Eucharistic sacrifice lost its essential character as a commemoration of the Divine *oikonomia* and became a mystery, the "holy things," as evidenced by liturgical and catechetical texts.[15] This trend Kretschmar finds more pronounced in the Christian East, noting that in the West this problem was not so imposing at this early time.[16]

Dom Gregory Dix, in keeping with Bishop's observations, also argues that the fourth-century proliferation of fear and trembling language in Christian liturgical texts represents a significant change from the earlier literature: "...not wholly out of connection with the past, but distinctly something new."[17] He likewise identifies St. Cyril as the first Father to employ, in his mystagogical writings, this kind of language in a "new" fashion. However, he argues that, with regard to the Eucharistic mystery, a preoccupation with the mystery itself and a coincident new interest in the "moment of consecration" are not themselves the origins of fear and trembling language. Nor, he argues, is such language necessarily the product of a "direct imitation of hellenistic mysteries."[18] He contends that little more than a "similar temper of thought" underlies the religious language of the mystery cults and the "new" emphasis on fear and awe in "Greek eucharistic devotion."[19]

This temperament, according to Dix, is a peculiar Syrian one (indeed, a Western Syrian temperament, Bishop would argue[20]), "where since time immemorial 'the holy' had also meant in some way 'the dangerous.'"[21] To such a natural Syrian understanding of the holy, in the style of Otto's fear before the *ganz andere*, Dix attributes the fourth-century proliferation of a liturgical concentration on awe and trembling language. The same temperament, he argues, almost simultaneously gave rise to the sanctuary veil, the first reference to which Dix finds in a homily given in Antioch by St. John Chrysostomos.[22] Although he does not state so clearly, one can de-

duce from Dix's discussion that these two new developments—the
language of fear and the appearance of the altar veil, which soon
evolved into the primitive *templon* [τέμπλον],[23] or altar screen, in
Constantinople—reinforced one another and secured their long his-
tory. The cost of these developments, in Dix's mind, was the ulti-
mate "*exclusion* of the laity from the process of the liturgical ac-
tion."[24]

In his complex, often confusing, and not always coherent book
on the changes in Christian worship after the Peace of Constantine,
Introduction to Liturgical Theology, Alexander Schmemann attrib-
utes the emergence of a language of fear and trembling in the fourth
century to what he calls a "new liturgical piety." He considers fear
and trembling language to be one facet of this new piety. More
boldly even than Bishop, he asserts that the adornment of fourth-
century liturgical texts with images of the awesome was a stark de-
parture from the ethos of the early Church and a development which
separated post-fourth-century worship from its roots, introducing "a
complexity…into the development of worship…[that]...made the
Christian cult in part something other than what it was in the early
Church."[25] Father Schmemann distinguishes this new liturgical pie-
ty from the very form and matter of religion and likens it to a "coef-
ficient of refraction" (a misappropriated metaphor) that indicates
how the "objective content of religion…can be variously accepted
and experienced (psychologically speaking) by the religious com-
munities of different periods, depending on the various cultural, spir-
itual and social peculiarities of the period."[26]

While Schmemann argues that a fourth-century change in
Christian liturgical piety subsequently affected "the further develop-
ment of the religion itself in its objective content," his summary
opinion is that these developments were minor and did not signifi-
cantly distort the integrity and meaning of the Church's primitive
lex orandi.[27] At the same time, oddly enough, he claims that fourth-
century and later changes in the Church's *experience* and *under-
standing* of worship are reflected in a lamentable sense of formal
piety that persists in a significant way, in the Eastern liturgical ex-
perience, to the present day. The liturgical piety of the fourth and
following centuries, Schmemann goes on to claim, was actually the
product of a dynamic interaction and, ultimately, the synthesis of
two new pieties: one, a mysteriological piety that flourished among
the rapidly expanding laity; and two, an individualistic piety of an
ascetic nature drawn from Christian monasticism. These are both,
he suggests, radical departures from the traditional ecclesiological

and eschatological piety known to the early Church.[28] While we are primarily concerned, here, with Schmemann's notion of a new "mysteriological" piety in fourth- and post-fourth-century worship, one is astonished at the scope of the changes in the Christian spiritual ethos that he envisions in the post-Constantinian Church. This is especially true when, at the same time, he posits that the integrity and meaning of the early Church's *lex orandi* survives this essential upheaval.

For Schmemann, the new mysteriological piety of the Church after the Peace of Constantine was an unavoidable consequence of the Church's acceptance of the challenge to convert the pagan masses:

> Both Constantine himself and the masses which followed him naturally brought into Christianity their own cultic understanding and experience of religion, their own liturgical piety.[29]

He defines this new piety as follows:

> The basic idea in this liturgical piety was the distinction between the profane and the sacred and, consequently, the understanding of the cult as primarily a system of ceremonies and ritual which transmits sacredness to the profane and establishes between the two the possibility of communion and communication.[30]

"On the theological level," Schmemann notes, "this mysteriological liturgical piety expressed itself mainly in the notion of consecration or initiation [in the Eucharist and Baptism]," an approach that involves a "step by step elevation through the degrees of a sacred mystery."[31] As this new theology developed, the "initiated" were first understood to be the faithful and the "uninitiated" the unbaptized. However, Schmemann asserts, this novel teaching developed into something else—something with quite another goal, which he finds set forth in the shockingly absurd words of Father N. Afanasiev:

> The doctrine of consecration did not remain on this narrow edge, since the idea of consecration has its own logic. Byzantine thought came to the conclusion that the true mystery of consecration was not Baptism, but the sacrament of Ordination. In the light of this theory the majority of those who had earlier been regarded as 'consecrated' [the laity] were now 'deconsecrated.'[32]

Needless to say, for Schmemann this altered theology and un-

derstanding of the Church's mysteries and ethos—this "mysteriological piety," with its distinction between the "sacred" and the "profane" and its notions of sanctification, consecration and initiation—constitutes not only a novelty, but a revolutionary change in Christian thought:

> The early Church lived with the consciousness of herself as the people of God, a royal priesthood, with the idea of election, and she did not apply the principle of consecration either to entry into the Church or much less to ordination to the various hierarchical orders.[33]

The same early Church, he assures us, also

> ...professed salvation not as the possibility of an individual or even collective deliverance from evil and sin, [*sic*] [;] it professed sanctification not as the possibility for the 'profane' to touch the 'sacred,' but proclaimed both as the eschatological fulfilment of the history of salvation, as the event leading man into the Aeon of the Kingdom of God.[34]

This transformation in the traditional piety of the Church was expressed and perpetuated, Father Schmemann writes, by a new "external solemnity" that was distinct from the "inner solemnity" known to the early Church. This "external solemnity" encompassed a new attitude towards buildings and localities: a "sacred topography." Whereas for the early Church, he claims, the church building itself played no "special role at all," by St. Constantine's time it had become the "church-sanctuary, a place for the habitation and residence of the sacred, capable therefore of sanctifying and communicating the sacred to whoever [*sic*] entered it."[35] The development and complication of ceremonies, with processions, hymnody, vestments, incense, candles, and so on, further augmented this new external solemnity, which now served as the agar for religious fear:

> External solemnity…consists in the sacralization of sacred ceremonies and actions, in emphasizing that they are not 'simple,' in building around them an atmosphere of sacred and religious fear which cannot fail to influence the way they are received and experienced by the participants in the cult.[36]

Schmemann feels that the pagan (mystery) cults were the source of the psychological and spiritual elements of this new liturgical piety in the Christian East of the fourth and subsequent centuries, as well as the language of fear and awe attendant to that piety.

The architectural and ceremonial elements of the "external solem-
nity" of this new piety, however, he attributes to the paradigm of
Imperial court ceremonial.[37]

Like Dix, Father Schmemann argues that the new piety of the
post-Constantinian Church, with its emphasis on fear of and awe be-
fore the sacred, led to an increasing alienation of the clergy from
the pious faithful, a "reformation of the very notion of the assembly
of the Church." Whereas for the pre-Nicene Fathers "the assembly
of the Church is thought of as the self-evident and necessary condi-
tion for the Sacrament," by "the Byzantine epoch," he avers, "the
emphasis was gradually transferred from the assembly of the Church
to the exclusive and actually self-sufficient significance of the cler-
gy as celebrants of the mystery."[38] These celebrants took on a
"mysterious, dreadful and sacred character."[39] Like Dix, Schme-
mann also argues that the development of the *templon*, separating
the altar and the Eucharistic mystery from the faithful, reflected a
new piety at odds with that of the early Church, creating a clear di-
vision between the clergy and the laity:

> One of the final stages of this development will be the transfer-
> ring of the name 'holy doors' from the doors of the church build-
> ing to the doors of the iconostasis, with the prohibiting of all but
> ordained persons to enter these doors.[40]

Father Schmemann finds in the fourth-century proliferation of
fear and trembling language and imagery in Christian worship a
model for what he believes were sweeping changes in Christian
worship, piety, and religious sensitivities in the post-Constantinian
Church. Indeed, the very core of his *Introduction to Liturgical Theol-
ogy,* one of the first English-language texts in this area by an Ortho-
dox scholar, is the firm message that Eastern Christian worship has
never recovered from the events of the fourth century. In many
ways, we might apply here an old Greek adage: " ὤδινεν ὄρος καὶ
ἔτεκεν μῦν" ["the mountain labored and bore a mouse"]. Unlike the
other scholars whom we have cited, Schmemann is unreserved in
his conviction that the fourth century saw a departure from the puri-
ty of the early Church's worship and ethos. This lack of reservation
prompts him to make assumptions unwarranted by a simple trend in
liturgical texts towards a language of awe and trembling, and cer-
tainly leads him to address issues of religious psychology in a con-
fused and ill-defined way.

One is led by Father Schmemann to believe that the "experi-

ence" and "understanding" of worship in the early Church were lost to fourth-century deviations from the "internal solemnity" of the former, but that, despite this, the *lex orandi* of the early Church survived these deviations unscathed. Aside from the fact that one must wonder about the parameters of a religious psychology that separates experience from the rule of worship and speaks in a wholly undefined way about internal and external solemnity, in many ways Father Schmemann seems to be, in the midst of arguing *for* the devastating effects of the fourth century on Eastern Christian worship, also arguing *against* its negative effects. Undoubtedly, all of this confusion stems from too catastrophic a view of history—ironically enough, a view against which Schmemann himself warns us.[41] The proliferation of a language of fear in the Christian mysteries in the fourth and subsequent centuries is an undoubted phenomenon, as evidenced by careful study of the liturgical texts of the mysteries of the Eucharist and Baptism, especially, and of Patristic writings in general. But the effect of this trend is certainly not as extensive as Schmemann contends, and therefore he is caught in the contradictions and inconsistencies that often mark overstatement. Let us, then, look at several scholars who maintain a more moderate view of the changes that took place in fourth-century Christian worship than that found in Bishop, Kretschmar, and Dix, and so overstated by Schmemann.

Johannes Quasten, writing on the liturgical mysticism of Theodore of Mopsuestia (*ca.* 350-428), notes that Theodore's language, in writing about the Eucharist and Baptism in particular, is not only laden with expressions about awe and mystery, but, as such, contains "peculiarities" which separate it both from the language used in earlier liturgical texts and commentaries and from contemporary Western sacramental texts.[42] Comparing the Eucharistic imagery of Mopsuestia to that used by St. Ambrose of Milan in his instructions to the newly Baptized, for example, Quasten points out that the latter likens the relationship of the soul to the Eucharist to the relationship between a bride and groom. The Eucharistic meal is a banquet to which Christ invites the soul, recalling the image of a wedding. These and other intimate images (such as those of fraternal ties between the soul and Christ), he argues, represent in St. Ambrose an "entirely different spiritual attitude towards the *mysterium fidei*" than that found in Theodore of Mopsuestia.[43]

In Mopsuestia's "mental attitude" toward the relationship between the soul and the Eucharist, Quasten observes, what he "demands of his listeners is entirely different":

The Bishop seeks instead to fill his audience with fear and trembling towards the Eucharistic mystery. He uses again and again expressions like 'awe-inspiring,' 'fearful,' 'with reverential fear,' etc. The Eucharistic service is called on several occasions 'awe-inspiring.' The liturgy is an 'awe-inspiring' service, the Holy Eucharist an 'awe-inspiring' sacrament. The Body of the Lord and the altar on which it rests are 'awe-inspiring.' The consecration is an 'awe-inspiring event' to the onlookers. The same is true of Holy Communion and the Eucharistic Table. Silence, immense fear, and reverential awe are demanded on account of the greatness of the offering.[44]

The relationship of the soul to Christ in the Christian mysteries, then, Quasten contends, is not for Theodore one of spiritual intimacy, but one of intense fear, awe, and trembling, as he demonstrates from a number of Theodore's commentaries on the Eucharist. He believes that Mopsuestia's approach to the theology of the Mysteries represents a peculiarly "Oriental" spirituality.[45] He cites, for example, representative quotations from Chrysostomos about the awesome nature of the mysteries that, indeed, reflect the mysteriological emphasis in liturgical texts from the fourth-century onwards:

He too calls the Eucharist 'a table of holy fear,' 'an awe-inspiring and divine table,' 'the frightful mysteries,' 'the mysteries which demand fear and trembling.' He calls the Eucharistic cup the 'cup of holy awe,' 'the frightful and most awe-inspiring cup,' 'the awe-inspiring blood,' and the 'precious blood.'[46]

Quasten rightly goes on to note that this same language can be found in the mystagogical catecheses of St. Cyril of Jerusalem. Also, unlike Bishop, he argues that fear and trembling language was present in the earliest Greek liturgies and that Bishop "was mistaken regarding the number" of fear and trembling passages in the liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions, which are more extensive than he admits.[47] In short, a language of fear was common to all of the "Oriental," churches and was not solely an Antiochian or Western Syrian phenomenon.

Unlike the foregoing scholars, Quasten does not posit that the evidence for a proliferation of a language of fear in the fourth-century liturgical and catechetical texts constitutes a new spirituality and a deviation from the early Church's worship. Rather, he argues that there are specific theological reasons for this proliferation. Because the Arian controversy had so occupied the Antiochian thinkers, he maintains, they tended, in their post-Nicene writings to

stress the majesty and "kingship" of Christ, thereby placing greater emphasis on the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son.[48] Like Schmemann, Quasten believes that the house churches of the primitive Church gave way to an imitation of court ceremony in both liturgical practice and in the construction of church edifices. For him, however, this imitative spirit is not adventitious or adventurous, as Schmemann suggests, but a direct outcome of the imagery of the "king" attached, in the fourth century, to the Son, in support of His Trinitarian consubstantiality. Court practice, in turn, contributed to a spirit of awe and fear in the Mysteries.[49]

Jungmann has also addressed attention to the appearance of the language of fear in fourth-century and subsequent liturgical writings, noting that Bishop sees in this appearance a change in the spirit of Christian worship from one of love to one of fear. He summarizes Bishop's thoughts as follows:

> Bishop...thinks that the first signs of this new spiritual attitude towards the sacrament of the altar are to be found in Cyril of Jerusalem.... But the traces are completely absent from the three Cappadocians. This austere feeling of sacred awe towards the sacrament, however, is characteristic of St. John Chrysostom. He speaks of the awful mysteries, the dreadful sacrifice, the fearful moment. ...Φρικτός, φοβερός, φρικωδέστατος were his favorite adjectives in this connexion, not that he used them all together or at every opportunity. Bishop cannot find a trace of this attitude in the earlier Fathers, nor indeed in the earlier liturgies, in Serapion, or in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, except for one instance..., and this he judges to be a pious formula.[50]

Jungmann, like Quasten, argues that the Antiochian emphasis on fear and trembling in St. John Chrysostomos, especially, represents a reaction to the Arian controversy and "a clarion proclamation of the consubstantiality of the Son of God."[51] He also feels that the singing of the Cherubic Hymn at the Great Entrance, instituted at the time of the Emperor Justin II (565-578), heightened the sense of awe among believers. But he attributes this not so much to the awe attendant to Imperial court ceremony, as to the awe of the majesty of Christ Himself:

> ...The faithful well may have experienced what the evangelists report several times of those who witnessed the miracles of Jesus—'they were exceedingly afraid'—and they may have drawn back in fearful awe from the divine mystery, as Peter ex-

claimed at the miraculous draught of fishes: 'Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord.' This gap between man and mystery may have been widened by the shutting off of the sanctuary...by a solid partition called the iconostasis.[52]

Jungmann supports his argument that the mysteriological language of the fourth-century liturgical texts was not an innovation, but a theological device—a reaction against Arianism—, by pointing out that "the expressions of fear and dread are stronger and more numerous in the liturgies of the Monophysites, who carried this opposition to extremes."[53]

Jungmann's most important contribution to the argument against a novel shift in Christian piety in fourth-century and later liturgical texts is his claim that a sense of awe and fear before the sacraments is not at all inconsistent with the "motive of love." Awe need not, he points out, attach only to "the fear of punishment or the sacrilegious reception of the sacrament"; rather, it can indicate nothing more than a "strong predominance of the greatness of God, which even in the holiest of souls must be added to confidence and love."[54] Thus, though the proliferation of fear and trembling language is pronounced in Antioch and the East, it is not an element foreign to universal Christian sensitivities.[55] Jungmann points out that elements of awe and fear developed in the Western liturgies, too, though later than in the East.[56] While acknowledging a change in emphasis in the language of the Eastern liturgies after the fourth century, he very wisely understands this as the development of one aspect of liturgical worship, bound to a theological reaction against the Arians, and expressive of a piety which is neither distinctly Eastern, revolutionary, or without expression in Western liturgical development.

Edward Yarnold gives us an interesting perspective on the fourth-century phenomenon of mysteriological language in Christian worship. He observes that by the fourth century, when the Greek Fathers supposedly borrowed heavily from the mystery cults in adding such language to Christian liturgical texts, the pagan cults

> ...were becoming magical rites or means of divination rather than a solemn experience of divine things which would move the initiate once and for all to live a holy life and would guarantee prosperity in this life and the next.[57]

At the same time, he argues, changes took place in the Christian mysteries. The character of the rite, as opposed to the content of the mystery, came to mark the Christian baptismal ritual, for ex-

ample, heightening "the resemblance between the pagan and the Christian mysteries." But this similarity, he goes on to assert, was not the result of a Christian imitation of the mystery rites as such, since, indeed, they were not a ready or intact model for the Christian liturgists to follow. Rather, certain Christian themes were expressed *in the language and ritual* of the dead mystery cults. He identifies five concepts borrowed from the mystery cults by the Fathers, which helped to transform the way that Christians looked at their mysteries, but which did not represent a break with the early Church.[58]

The first of these is the *disciplina arcani*, or a discipline of secrecy. Yarnold observes that there is a New Testamental precedent for this discipline: "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine" (St. Matthew 7:6). Thus the desire to protect Christianity from the scoffing eyes of unbelievers led to an adoption of the secrecy that marked the mystery cults. The second of these themes is that of "mystagogy," or explaining the secret mysteries to Christian initiates only—that is, to the baptized (usually on the eve of Pascha, or Easter). Yarnold points out that, though they borrowed the notion of mystagogical initiation from the mystery cults, the Fathers used it as a pedagogical device. Thus, those who experienced communion, without previously knowing of it, better understood, when it was subsequently explained to them, the mystery. The third theme taken from the mystery cults involves dramatic effects: the preparation of catechumens with instruction and fasting (though this is certainly not only a fourth-century practice), the creation of an intense expectation of Baptism on Holy Saturday, and the service of pre-Baptismal exorcism (which Yarnold sees as a rite heavily influenced by the mystery cults—though exorcism, again, is not something foreign to Christian practice or of fourth-century origin). The fourth theme, contemplation (ἐποπτεία, or, better, "reflection"), or the attachment of importance to the seeing of holy objects (the baptismal font, the altar, or the Eucharist) Yarnold sees as an artifact from the mystery cults, though one might argue that the notion of "enlightenment" as an image of Christian Baptism might have easily led to the exercise of a "new way of seeing" in the Christian mysteries. Finally, he argues that one's sharing in the passion of Christ is reminiscent of the participation of worshippers in the sufferings of the pagan gods. Again, however, one can look even to Scriptural references to this kind (e.g., St. Paul's famous exclamation, "I am crucified with Christ" (Galatians 2:20) or "...so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized

into his death" (Romans 6:3).[59]

Yarnold's contribution to our understanding of fourth-century mysteriological language and imagery in Christian worship, and especially in the Eucharist and Baptism, is, again, his implicit contention that Christianity did not borrow from the living tradition of the mystery cults, but appropriated for itself some of the artifacts of the mystery cults to emphasize and reinforce certain Christian beliefs and tendencies. One might not, as my interjectory remarks in the last paragraph suggest, fully embrace the parallels which Yarnold imagines, but certainly he establishes that, at least from the pedagogical standpoint, the dead mystery cults offered the Christian Church images and practices which expressed her faith with some fidelity. This very claim calls into question the notion that the mystery cults introduced something new into Christian worship—an unlikely phenomenon given their moribund state and the extant body of Christian beliefs and customs to which their images and practices could be adapted. As Yarnold writes, the Christian Church, enhanced by this adaptation, "began to lend a colour to every aspect of worship which spread up from Jerusalem to Antioch where it rapidly developed." He notes that A.H.M. Jones has characterized this phenomenon as "the superstition that corrupted the Church at this time." Yarnold admits that "abuses there certainly were," but adds: "...Could not our own secularist age profit by a mild experience of *phrike*?"

Robert Taft has written an illuminating paper on the liturgy of the Great Church of Constantinople.[60] In it, he touches on the issue of the proliferation of fear and trembling language in fourth-century and later liturgical texts. His statement is an excellent summary of the issue and provides a balance between the extreme views that we have presented of the language of fear, on the one hand, as something novel and revolutionary in Christian spirituality and, on the other hand, as a development natural to the theological and pedagogical needs of the Christian Church. Father Taft characteristically calls the fourth century a century of synthesis. Speaking of the Eucharist, he says:

> What we see is a subtle shift in emphasis from praise of God for all His gifts to a more explicit anamnesis of Christ's economy, the chief motive for this praise; and from Christ's presence in the gifts to His presence also as eternal offerer of the gifts before the throne of God.[61]

As the Church became a free and public institution, invaded by

a "flood of converts of convenience and returned apostates," the close-knit Christian community disappeared.

> Under such conditions the eucharist could no longer sustain its former ideology as a rite of κοινωνία, and Antiochene liturgical explanation begins to elaborate a symbolism of the presence of the saving work of Christ *in the ritual itself*, even apart from participation in the communion of the gifts.[62] [italics mine]

Taft also notes that the Arian controversy led to the shift in emphasis in liturgical texts in Antioch that partly accounts for the fourth-century proliferation of fear and trembling language. He very concisely sums up the complex rôle played by the Arian controversy in this shift:

> The Arians had argued that the liturgy itself, in praying to the Father *through* the Son, was subordinationist. Orthodoxy reacted by leveling the doxological formulae ('...to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Spirit...'), and by stressing the two-natures doctrine, according to which Christ is mediator not as subordinate to the Father in divinity, but as man. This solution led...among the Antiochenes to a greater stress on Christ's high priesthood as pertaining to his humanity...; it produced in the fourth-century writers...a renewed emphasis on Christ's saving work.[63]

This emphasis on Christ's saving work manifested itself in the liturgical vision of the "historical self-offering of Christ and the heavenly liturgy, united in a system of ritual representation" in which the memory of Christ's salvific work "is conceived as a dramatic re-enactment of the paschal mystery encompassing the whole eucharistic rite." At the same time, "the earthly celebrant is seen as an image of the heavenly high priest, the earthly liturgy as an icon of His heavenly oblation." These two elements in liturgical worship, Taft says, become the "two leitmotifs" that form the "basis of the later Byzantine liturgical synthesis."[64] They also account for the language of awe and trembling that enter into a Eucharistic celebration which envisions Christ Himself as the "offerer and offered" and the celebration as a heavenly event.

Though Taft looks at the proliferation of the language of fear in fourth-century and later Eucharistic texts as evidence of a change in the focus of Christian worship, he understands this change as a synthesis of already existing trends in that worship. The mysteriological language emanating from Antioch he sees as a natural response to the theological threat of Arianism and as part of a complex attempt

to deal with the changing social realities of the Christian world after the Peace of Constantine in 313. There is no catastrophic tone in Taft's acknowledgement of this response and the changes which it entailed. He posits no tremendous inconsistency between the worship of the primitive Church and the post-fourth-century Church, on the one hand, and does not, on the other hand, attribute the changes which actually took place to excessive Hellenistic influence or to a wholesale adoption of the language and ethos of the mystery cults. And, most importantly, his analysis of the change in liturgical tone that we see in the fourth century aims at a statement of process that encompasses the subsequent maturation and development of the later Byzantine Liturgy. Father Taft provides, I think, the most comprehensive overview of fourth-century liturgical developments. Even if one may not agree with every aspect of his analysis, his conclusions are consistent with the more moderate views of these developments which we have cited above.

A few summary remarks, drawn from the foregoing survey of the proliferation of fear and trembling language in fourth- and post-fourth-century liturgical and catechetical texts, are in order. In the first place, this phenomenon is in many ways a scholarly artifact. One can argue, indeed, that fear and trembling language is present in fourth-century liturgical texts with a frequency unknown in earlier documents. At the same time, we must remember that, partially as a consequence of the Peace of the Church, liturgical commentaries themselves proliferated in the fourth and subsequent centuries. It is only natural, then, that certain themes in these commentaries should also proliferate. Secondly, one cannot simply amass references to fear and trembling in liturgical texts and claim that these reflect the influence of the mystery cults. One must look at how such references fit into the language of Patristic commentaries in general. Gerhard Fittkau has argued that the mysteriological language which St. John Chrysostomos, at least, applies to the sacramental mysteries is in fact no different from, but "identical" with, the mysteriological language he uses in his other commentaries.[65] In keeping with Fittkau's observation, Schulz asserts that St. John Chrysostomos' use of the language of awe is based on his understanding of mystery "...in the specifically Christian sense as referring to God's decree of salvation and its revelation in Jesus Christ."[66] This understanding, he adds,

> ...allows this Church Father not only to apply the term to the sacraments, especially the eucharist, and other ecclesial realities as well, but also to make clear the place of all these within

the overall order of salvation. As a result it is all the easier to see the importance that Chrysostom assigns to the sphere of worship and sacrament and to the liturgy. For out of the approximately 275 passages in which the word mystery appears in Chrysostom's works, the plural, *mysteria*, occurs in 200; of these the reference in 160 is to worship and the sacraments, while of these 125 are to the eucharistic mysteries.[67]

In short, Chrysostomos' references to the sacramental mysteries are not so much the result of his preoccupation with Hellenism and the mystery cults as they are the product of his vision of the mystery of the Christian *oikonomia*. Moreover, if I may turn Schulz's argument against him, St. John Chrysostomos does not use the word mystery *exclusively* to describe the Christian sacraments or the Eucharistic rite.

It is also important that we take into consideration the fact that the fourth-century Peace of the Church not only saw a vast increase in the number of liturgical texts and commentaries, but that liturgical texts quite naturally became more ornate and complete. The primitive Church was a struggling Church. What documentation it bequeaths to us reflects the essential concerns of a persecuted faith. If later texts constitute an elaboration on this documentation, this elaboration is not necessarily a product of Hellenization or an outright imitation of the mystery cults. It can be argued that oral tradition began to take on a written form in the fourth century and that hidden or even latent trends in the early Church were then made manifest.

While the fourth-century emphasis on mystery is not necessarily imitative of the mystery cults, and while it can be established that, very early on, Christians often tried to *distinguish* their rites from those of the Jews[68] and the pagans, Christianity did, nonetheless, adapt some things from these traditions to its own usage—just as it "baptized" neo-Platonic language and imagery as a tool for Christian apologetics. This selective borrowing occurred long before the fourth century, and one can imagine that the fourth century saw a careful use of what was earlier borrowed from the already moribund Hellenic world and its mystery cults. But again, this phenomenon must be seen in context. It does not represent the vitiation of the Christian mysteries by pagan influence, but stems from the Chris-

tian understanding that the pre-Christian mystery religions were the precursors of Christianity. Dom Odo Casel writes of the ancient [pagan] mysteries that

> ...they, too, as the fathers and St. Augustine in particular say of the heathen sacrifices, were shadows, if misleading ones, of the true mystery to come. We can understand, then, that the fathers with advancing clarity discover the true mystery in Christianity and seek in some way to express divine truth by using the terminology of the mysteries, (purified and raised), for the Christian rites.[69]

Thus, there is a Christian philosophical element which must not be set aside in investigating the proposition that fourth-century Christian worship underwent a transformation by association with and in imitation of the pagan Hellenic world.

In general, we should be careful, too, about religious psychological portrayals of Christian worship in the fourth century and subsequently. We have little evidence to suggest that a sense of fear and trembling was absent from the primitive Church and that this sense entered into the Christian world of the fourth century as a novelty of sorts. The early Christians were secretive about their rites and, as we have said, were not as free as post-Constantinian Christians to produce and circulate liturgical texts. We should not take their silence as evidence of a different spirit of worship. Moreover, it well may have been quite unnecessary for the early Christians to emphasize the awesomeness of the Christian mysteries. There are two reasons for this. First, under the threat of persecution, their religious psychology was naturally affixed to feelings of awe and fear. They were, after all, engaged in rites which were illegal and in a religious community that frequently gave up its members to the frightful and awesome mystery of martyrdom. These circumstances created a natural psychology of awe. As well, the early Christians were nearer to the miraculous events which were the very substance of the Mysteries—they were closer to the salvific work of Christ on earth. They must have maintained a sense of awe and dread before these events that only waned with the passing of centuries—an experiential sense which the fourth-century liturgical texts reinforce by words and mnemonic or dramatic devices.[70] Father Baldovin has de-

scribed this process quite simply as one of protecting the mystery of the Eucharist by perfectly consistent language.[71]

Finally, it behooves us to point out that, whatever effect the mystery cults and their attendant characteristics of awesome inspiration and fear might have had on Christian worship in the fourth century and thereafter, a language of fear and trembling is not unknown in the basic *corpus* of Christian doctrine and spirituality, the New Testament. Such language, in fact, is neither absent from the scriptural witness nor is its association with the Christian mysteries an unknown element. Let us look, for example, at the day of Pentecost as it is described in the book of Acts. In response to St. Peter's homily, more than three thousand people were baptized. They are described as having broken [the] bread [of the Eucharist] and having prayed. Then, "...fear came upon every soul" ["ἐγένετο δὲ πάσῃ ψυχῇ φόβος"]. Here, indeed, we have a clear association of fear with the mysteries of Baptism and the Eucharist.[72] Moreover, that fear and trembling are associated with the apostolic office and the priesthood is amply demonstrated by St. Paul's words to the Church in Corinth. Speaking to them of St. Titus, he commends them for having received him obediently and with "fear and trembling" ["μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου"].[73] Indeed, St. Paul writes to the Church in Philippi, exhorting them to work out their very salvation "with fear and trembling."[74] If then, there is pagan influence in the notion of fear and trembling in the Christian liturgical documents of the fourth and subsequent centuries, this is perhaps as old as Scripture itself, from which we might cite yet other and numerous references to fear and trembling before the Christian mysteries, the appointed clergy, the majesty of Christ,[75] and the salvation experience.

> Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved, let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and fear.[76]

_____

Notes

1. A.H.M. Jones, "The Social Background of the Struggle Between Paganism and Christianity," in *The Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity in*

the Fourth Century, ed. Arnaldo Momigliano (Oxford, 1962).

2.   *Ibid.*, pp. 20-21. There is little doubt that a great ornamentation of liturgical language took place in the post-fourth-century Church and that the writing of hymns according to a classical model aroused the particular ire of the early monastics. (Hieromonk [now Bishop] Auxentios, "The Development of Vespers," *Orthodox Tradition* 5[2&3]: 30-39, 42-51.) However, that this embellishment in hymnodic form represented a stark departure from the supposedly crude language and imagery of early Scriptural and other ecclesiastical writings is open to debate. First, the Gospels and the Epistles of St. Paul are rich in the same imagery found in the mystery religions. Second, there are many accomplished Greek scholars who, with a good command of English and Greek in its several ancient and modern forms, would argue that the Greek of early Christian writings was not crude in form, tone, or expression when compared to that of later Christian writings and the Church's post-fourth-century hymnology and liturgical language. (See Bishop Chrysostomos, "Questions and Answers about the Orthodox Faith," *Orthodox Tradition* 1[4&5]: 39-40.) And finally, one authority has shown that the post-fourth-century liturgy of St. John Chrysostom contains an astounding number of references to Biblical texts themselves—"...imbued, one might almost say immersed, with Scriptural verses and allusions"—, a fact which certainly argues against support for an abrupt and pronounced movement towards a new mysteriological language and imagery from the linguistic standpoint (Demetrios J. Constantelos, "The Holy Scripture in Greek Orthodox Worship," *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 12[1]: 9).

3.   Edmund Bishop, "Fear and Awe Attaching to the Eucharistic Service," in *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*, tr. Dom R.H. Connolly (Cambridge: University Press, 1909).

4.   Though some scholars have argued that they were subsequently edited and supplemented by his successor in the See of Jerusalem, the current consensus is that these mystagogical texts were authored by St. Cyril. The English texts can be found in *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, 2nd ser., ed. Philip Shaff and Henry Wace (Grand Rapids, MI, 1969), Vol. 7, pp. 1-157.

5.   *Ibid.*, p. 93.

6.   *Ibid.*, p. 92.

7.   *Ibid.*, p. 94.

8.   *Ibid.* This is, of course, an overstatement. Bishop could not be unfamiliar with St. Basil's famous comments on the "dread" with which Christians should receive "the Body and Blood of Christ" (*P.G.*, Vol. XXXI, col. 1195).

9.   This language is evident in the earliest extant MS of Chrysostomos' Liturgy, the so-called "Barberini Manuscript," both in the Eucharistic exclamations and in the Priest's prayers before the altar. See C.A. Swainson, *The Greek Liturgies* (Cambridge: University Press, 1884), e.g., pp. 89 (μετὰ φόβου), 93 (φρικτῶν μυστηρίων, σοὶ τῷ φοβερῷ Θεῷ), 94 (σῶσον ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ φόβῳ σου), et al.

10.   *Ibid.*, pp. 95-96.

11.   *Ibid.*, p. 96.

12.   *Ibid.*, pp. 96-97. Bishop speculates that this influence was mitigated

by a spirit of reserve reminiscent of the Cappadocian Fathers, at least in Eastern Syria, arguing against his contention that the Cappadocians stood in sharp contrast to Chrysostomos in their rejection of fear and trembling language and suggesting, in turn, that he acknowledges the presence, however limited, of such language in the Cappadocians.

13. Georg Kretschmar, "Abendmahl III/1: Alte Kirche," in *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* (Berlin, 1977), 1, 78.

14. An excellent source of comparative excerpts from the fourth-century Fathers on Baptism is H. Riley, *A Comparative Study of the Interpretation of the Baptismal Liturgy in the Mystagogical Writings of Cyril of Jerusalem, John Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia and Ambrose of Milan*, The Catholic University of America Studies in Christian Antiquity, 17 (Washington, D.C., 1974).

15. *Ibid.*

16. *Ibid.*, p. 78.

17. Dom Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1982), p. 200.

18. *Ibid.*, p. 483.

19. *Ibid.*

20. Bishop, "Fear and Awe," p. 96.

21. *Ibid.*, p. 480. As historical evidence of this temperament, Dix cites God's smiting of Uzzah, after the latter's hapless act of touching the Ark (2 Samuel 6:7 [2 Kings 6:7 in LXX]).

22. *Ibid.*, pp. 480–81. The homily was delivered shortly after 390. Though not our specific concern here, it is astonishing that Dix and other scholars so often overlook the Temple veil as a possible prototype for the altar veil in Christian worship. Even as it occurs in contemporary Eastern Christian worship, the opening and closing of the *templon* doors and the altar veil correspond to the symbols of Divine *oikonomia*—the Fall, the Incarnation, the redemptive work of Christ on earth, etc.

23. Invariably, but quite incorrectly, called the *(e)ikonostasion* [εἰκονοστάσιον] or *ik(c)onostasis*.

24. *Ibid.*, p. 481. It is interesting to note that Dix links the development of fear and trembling language in the Liturgy to the alienation of worshippers from the Eucharistic mystery. It thus follows that, if this development was effected by the incursion of the spirit of the Hellenistic mystery cults into fourth-century Christian worship (an argument to which Dix himself does not unreservedly adhere), then the mystery cults must have also experienced an alienation of officiants from participants or of participants from the cult's mysteries. Yet, while we know that there were defined officiants and prophetic offices in the mystery cults and that their mysteries were marked by an atmosphere of awe, it is nonetheless widely argued that these cults provided a sense of communal solidarity in the face of a deteriorating secular social structure. This provision is inconsistent with the supposedly disintegrating effects of the introduction from the Hellenistic mystery cults of a language of fear into the Christian mysteries—an inconsistency worthy of further study.

25. Alexander Schmemann, *Introduction to Liturgical Theology* (New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1975), p. 78. This is not an area of re-

search in which Schmemann's otherwiseconsiderable scholarly skills are evident. His conclusions are often hastily drawn, greatly dependent on Western sources, and at odds with traditional Orthodox thinking about liturgical development—thinking which he neither acknowledges as important nor cites in any comprehensive way at all. The various liturgical theories of the eminent Greek liturgical scholar Ioannes Fountoules, for example, he fails to cite even once in his text. One might also mention various Russian authorities whom Schmemann likewise ignores.

26.   *Ibid.*, pp. 76–77.

27.   *Ibid.*, p. 77. Also see his concluding remarks, pp. 162–167.

28.   *Ibid.*, p. 81. Cf. pp. 101ff.

29.   *Ibid.*, p. 87.

30.   *Ibid.*, pp. 97–98.

31.   *Ibid.*, p. 100.

32.   *Ibid.*, p. 101. One can only express amazement at Afanasiev's sweeping generalization about Byzantine thought and its ostensible preoccupation with ordination over and above initiation. This notion is at best overstated, at worst generally unsupportable, if not absurd.

33.   *Ibid.*, p. 100.

34.   *Ibid.*, p. 98.

35.   *Ibid.*, p. 89. One must note that Schmemann's claim disregards the argument that the Peace of the Church involved a natural manifestation of awe for sacred space that was not perhaps possible in the captive Church, where fear and trembling were of necessity attached to the threat of the lion's mouth or the imperial sword.

36.   *Ibid.*, p. 94.

37.   *Ibid.* Another scholar, in his interesting study of the development of Byzantine liturgical dress, argues that Church vestments developed in accordance with the imperial model, the Church at times directly appropriating court appointments for ecclesiastical use. However, he generally identifies this process with post-sixth-century trends and the post-Byzantine Church of the Turkish captivity. (See Archimandrite [now Archbishop] Chrysostomos, *Byzantine Liturgical Dress* (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1981).) It remains to be demonstrated, then, that there were parallels between court and Church ceremonials as early as the late fourth and the fifth centuries—something which Schmemann fails to do. Moreover, from the standpoint of religious psychology, it would be difficult to establish that the fear provoked by a Christian's appearance in the imperial court was really the same kind of affective phenomenon that Schmemann sees in the fear of the sacred which accrues to religious architecture and ceremony.

38.   *Ibid.*, p. 99. This is a strange claim, when one realizes that already by the "Byzantine epoch" of which Father Schmemann speaks the concept of public worship was strongly implanted in the Eastern Christian mentality. A private Liturgy then, as now, was disallowed in the Byzantine Church, a point which calls into question Schmemann's notion of the "self-sufficient significance" of the clergy.

39.   *Ibid.*, pp. 98–99.

40. *Ibid.*, p. 99. There is some evidence, wholly ignored by Schmemann, that the altar screen developed independently of the trends in post-fourth-century worship, that it is in fact of earlier origin, and that its purpose was not to separate the clergy from the faithful, but to define sacred space itself: a pedagogical device, as it were. (See Leonide Ouspensky, "The Problem of the Iconostasis," *St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly* 8 [1964]: 186-218; *Encylopedia Cattolica* [Firenze, 1957], 6, 1552-1553, s.v. "Iconòstasi"; and Karl Holl, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte* [Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1928], II, 225-237.) Furthermore, Schmemann fails to provide any evidence for his claim that the church doors in the early Church suddenly became the "holy doors" of the *templon*. Even if this were a tenable argument, he would be left to treat at length with the distinction between the "holy" or "beautiful" gates and the royal doors. Are the latter taken from the church doors or from the beautiful gates? If so, then we must ask what distinctions were originally made between the imperial worshippers and the clergy themselves. In other words, Schmemann has touched, here, on a complex matter which does not yield to simplistic analysis or provide anything like unequivocal support for his view of the *templon* and the holy doors as devices that contributed to a separation of the faithful from the clergy.

41. Schmemann, *Liturgical Theology*, p. 76.

42. Johannes Quasten, "The Liturgical Mysticism of Theodore of Mopsuestia," *Theological Studies* 15(1954): 431. See A. Mingana, *Commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Lord's Prayer and on the Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist* (Cambridge, 1933).

43. *Ibid.*

44. *Ibid.*, p. 432.

45. *Ibid.* While Mopsuestia employs a language of fear in speaking of the Eucharist, I have elsewhere argued that his Nestorian Christology deeply affects his Eucharistic theology and that this theology is at odds with that of the Orthodox Eastern Fathers. One must, therefore, be cautious in characterizing his writings as perfectly representative of Eastern Orthodoxy. See my "Christological Methods and Their Influence on Alexandrian and Antiochian Eucharistic Theology," *The Patristic and Byzantine Review* 11 (1992).

46. *Ibid.*, p. 236.

47. *Ibid.*, p. 437.

48. Thus Quasten acknowledges, like Schmemann, that the development of the *templon* separated the people from the clergy, but this for the very purpose of focusing the liturgical service on the majesty of Christ. This focus was served, Quasten asserts, by the brief and intermittent glimpses that the faithful had of the altar itself, thus creating a sense of expectation and awe. See esp. his "*Mysterium Tremendum*: Eucharistische Frömmigkeitsauffassungen des vierten Jahrhunderts," in *Vom Christlichen Mysterium*, A.C. Mayer et al. (Düsseldorf, 1951), p. 72.

49. Once again, I believe that one must be cautious about the nexus between fear and trembling language and the imperial court. Quasten's evidence for such an association is scanty at best. (His association of the Great Entrance with the entrance of the Divine majesty of Christ, for example, hardly suggests an importation of court ceremonial into the Church. This is not an image unknown in

pre-Nicene theological parlance.) Furthermore, the reservations about an affective equivalency between religious awe and the fear of the court that apply to Schmemann's comments apply equally aptly to those of Quasten. Undoubtedly, since court ceremonial did enter into the Church in the fourth century, it helped reinforce feelings of religious awe. But it is not necessarily the source of that awe. Nor, again, is there evidence that court ceremonial so tremendously influenced the core of Christian worship this early on.

50.   J.A. Jungmann, *The Place of Christ in Liturgical Prayer* (New York, 1965), p. 247. We must remember that, despite Bishop's claim that the earlier Greek liturgies contained virtually no references to fear and awe, he is obliged to admit that the non-Greek, Eastern Syrian liturgies did contain several such references. While he attributes this to foreign influence from the Greeks, he has no proof of this contention. Jungmann might have cited these references as evidence for a universal tendency towards a spirit of awe and fear in Christian worship. (See Bishop, "Fear and Awe," p. 96.)

51.   *Ibid.*, p. 248.

52.   *Ibid.*, p. 249. It is interesting to note that Jungmann follows Quasten's thought in asserting that the *"iconostasis"* served to heighten the distinction between "man and mystery," not the server and the faithful.

53.   *Ibid.*, p. 250.

54.   *Ibid.*, p. 252.

55.   It is essential to note here that Jungmann, of all the commentators on the fourth-century transformation of liturgical languages, rejects the idea that a language of awe and trembling is absent from the language of the Cappadocian Fathers. In fact, he cites evidence of St. Basil's understanding of the dread surrounding the reception of the Eucharist. (See note 8, above.)

56.   *Ibid.*, pp. 255ff.

57.   Edward Yarnold, "Baptism and the Pagan Mysteries in the Fourth Century," *The Heythrop Journal*, 13 (1972): 256.

58.   *Ibid.*, pp. 257-258.

59.   *Ibid.*, pp. 258-263 *pass.*

60.   Robert Taft, S.J., "The Liturgy of the Great Church: An Initial Synthesis of Structure and Interpretation on the Eve of Iconoclasm," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 34-35 (1980-1981): 45-75.

61.   *Ibid.*, p. 68.

62.   *Ibid.*, pp. 68, 69.

63.   *Ibid.*, p. 69.

64.   *Ibid.*, p. 70.

65.   Gerhard Fittkau, *Der Begriff des Mysteriums bei Johannes Chrysostomus* (Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1953), p. 87.

66.   Hans-Joachim Schulz, *The Byzantine Liturgy*, tr. Matthew J. O'Connell (New York: Pueblo Publishing, 1986), p. 16.

67.   *Ibid.*

68.   See, for example, the instructions for fasting in the *Didache*, in which Christians are advised not to fast in conjunction with Jewish days of fasting. (*The Apostolic Fathers* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975 [reprint]), Vol. I , p. 321). Talley has, I should note, warned against an overstate-

ment of this principle, remarking that "although...[Christian practices]...diverge from the contemporary development of Judaism in the second century, [they] are seldom motivated by deliberate dissociation from inherited patterns." (See Thomas J. Talley, *The Origins of the Liturgical Year* [New York: Pueblo Publishing, 1986].) We are not here speaking of "inherited" patterns, but of the *direct imitation* of Jewish customs.

69.   Odo Casel, *The Mystery of Christian Worship*, ed. Burkhard Neunheuser (London, 1962), p. 60.

70.   For example, in the life of St. Meletios the Confessor of Mount Galesion, we read that even as late as the thirteenth century the tomb of Christ "constantly gave forth a mystical light." (See this life in the *Μέγας Συναξαριστὴς τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Ἐκκλησίας* [Athens, 1978].) As this phenomenon subsided, greater attention was placed on the ritual surrounding the mystery of the Paschal light. This was not, perhaps, a new creation or a novel piety, but the commemoration of a lost mystery which came to manifest itself only once a year. Thus, the fourth century may have similarly reacted to a loss of the experiential awe of the early Christians by focusing on the most important remnants of the salvific life of Christ, the mysteries themselves, with a language of awe and mystery.

71.   John Baldovin, S.J., *Liturgy in Ancient Jerusalem* (Nottingham, England: Grove Books, 1989), p. 25.

72.   Acts 2:40-43.

73.   II Corinthians 7:15.

74.   Philippians 2:12.

75.   II Peter 1:16.

76.   Hebrews 12:28.